

subject matter is determined. Such secondary considerations as commercial success, long felt but unsolved needs, failure of others, etc., might be utilized to give light to the circumstances surrounding the origin of the subject matter sought to be patented. As indicia of obviousness or nonobviousness, these inquiries may have relevancy.” *Graham v. Deere*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966).

Claim 1 recites, “A method of displaying digital video data comprising pixel values using pulse width modulation, said method comprising the steps of: offsetting a first pixel value a first predetermined amount to form a first offset pixel value and displaying said first offset pixel value during a first display frame; and offsetting said first pixel value by the opposite of said first predetermined amount to form a second offset pixel value and displaying said second offset pixel value during a second display frame, such that the average of said displayed first offset pixel value and said second offset pixel value is said first pixel value.” The Examiner has not attempted to read Fossum on the limitations of Claim 1.

Claim 6 recites, “A system of displaying digital video data comprising pixel values, comprising: a logic circuit offsetting a first pixel value a first predetermined amount to form a first offset pixel value, said logic circuit also offsetting said first said pixel value by the opposite of said first predetermined amount to form a second offset pixel value; and display means displaying said first offset pixel value during a first display frame and displaying said second offset pixel value during a second display frame, such that the average of said displayed first offset pixel value and said second offset pixel value is said first pixel value.” The Examiner has not attempted to read Fossum on the limitations of Claim 6.

With regard to Claim 1, the Examiner stated, “Fossum teaches, referring to Fig. 2, a method of digital data which includes a step of positive offsetting ‘ $It + \max/2n$ ’ at step 206 by a first predetermined amount ($+\max/2n$) to form a first offset pixel value (output $b_{(n-1)2}=1$) and the method of negative offsetting ‘ $It - \max/2n$ ’ at step 210 by the opposite of the first predetermined amount ($-\max/2n$) to form a second offset pixel value (output $b_n=0$), such that the average of (output $b_{(n-1)2}=1$) and (output $b_n=0$) at step 200 by half scale $(\min + \max)/2$ or $(0+1)/2$ where the lowest (zero scale) value and \max is the full scale value (see col. 2, lines 30-32).”

The applicant respectfully submits this statement is not complete. Furthermore, it is not a

fair characterization of Fossum. The passage of Fossum cited by the Examiner states, "The process starts at step 200 by 'guessing' half scale $(\text{min} + \text{max})/2 = 0.5$ where min is the lowest (zero scale) value and max is the full scale value." Fossum teaches "A digital median filter . . . using a successive approximation A/D converter circuit, which is arranged to produce an output based on majority weighting" (abstract of Fossum).

With regard to Claim 6 the Examiner stated, "Dean teaches a system of displaying digital video data which includes the equivalent logic circuit offsetting pixel value such as mid range technique (col. 2, lines 61-62)" The application respectfully submits this is a gross mischaracterization of Dean. The passage referred to by the Examiner as a "mid-range technique" states, "the quality of the interlace-to-progressive conversion is at least high enough for "mid-range" progressive display systems."

The Examiner has the duty to present a prima facie obviousness rejection. Under Graham, this requires determining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue. The Examiner has utterly failed to read the prior art onto the limitations recited by the claims at issue. Without comparison of the prior art to the claim limitations, the Examiner cannot determine the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue. Therefore the Examiner's statement that "Fossum teaches all of the claimed limitations of claim 1, except for displaying the first offset pixel value during a first display frame, and displaying the second offset pixel value during a second display frame" is unjustified.

"To support the conclusion that the claimed combination is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed combination or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references." Ex parte Clapp, 227 U.S.P.Q. 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

The Examiner has not pointed to any teaching in the prior art suggesting the modifications proposed by the Examiner.

Claims 2-5 and 7-10 depend from Claims 1 or 6 and should be deemed allowable for that reason and on their own merits.

For the reasons stated above, the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is

defective and should be withdrawn.

In view of the amendments and the remarks presented herewith, it is believed that the claims currently in the application, Claims 1-10, accord with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are allowable over the prior art of record. Therefore, it is urged that Claims 1-10 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles A. Brill
Reg. No. 37,786

Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474 M/S 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-4379
FAX: (972) 917-4418